



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1459  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,846	12/09/2003	Frederick J. Dillman	BB012A	4410
7590 Unisys Corporation Attn: Lise A. Rode Unisys Way, MS/E8-114 Blue Bell, PA 19424-0001				
EXAMINER KENDALL, CHUCK O				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2192				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/02/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/731,846

**Applicant(s)**

DILLMAN ET AL.

**Examiner**

CHUCK O. KENDALL

**Art Unit**

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **Detailed Action**

1. This office action is in response to the action filed on 02/11/08.
2. Claims 1 – 26 have been amended.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 4, 10 – 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al. US 2002/0091990 A1 in view of Lau 5,987,247.

Regarding claim 1, Little discloses a method of providing a software-based solution for an enterprise, comprising:  
selecting a blueprint from a plurality of blueprints, wherein each of said plurality of blueprints comprising information relating to a particular industry, said blueprint being selected based on a first *industry* in which the enterprise operates ([0098], see UML

model 112, also see [0387], Claim 21, which discloses a model repository for storing and retrieving design models/plurality of models as well as [0242] which shows how the builder relates the field name and field types with the specifications of the models, also refer to [0124] where examiner has interpreted the requirements to be the blueprints as claimed above);

selecting or creating functional components based on said blueprint ([0128], see use cases also see [0131] for components);

providing documentation with at least one functional component, wherein the documentation specifies a relationship between at least two functional components, thereby enabling traceability between the at least two functional components (see [0145], which discloses functional description of the system also see paragraph, 0130 which also shows providing documentation as part of the UML model);

creating the software-based solution based on the functional components [0137];  
deploying the software-based solution in an infrastructure of the enterprise [0138];

Little doesn't explicitly disclose wherein it provides a cross-referenced representation of business processes that occur within the enterprise. However, Lau in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses in (13:65 - 14:20) that,

"...artifacts are generated by the parsing and importing subsystem by parsing the interface definition stored in the source files...Once the interface definitions have been parsed, the parsing and importing subsystem then stores (i.e, imports) the parsed interfaced definitions...Once the parsed interface definition has been imported into the

data model, the same template based code generation scheme is used by the code generator to emit the necessary code to make the generated object correspond to the Business Object environment...". Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine, little and Lau, because it would enable referencing parsed definitions for corresponding Business object environments as suggested by Lau above.

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1, wherein the relationship is between a first element of a first functional component and a second element (0130, describes dynamic relationships between the state diagrams).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 1, wherein the second element is within a second functional component (0114 shows creation of a new model element of different types, examiner interprets the interaction with the different types to be the functional components).

Regarding claim 4, method of claim 1, wherein the relationship is represented in software (0130, describes dynamic relationship, examiner understands this to be in software).

Regarding claim 10 the method of claim 1, wherein providing documentation further comprises transforming a blueprint model between two modeling tools, two

development tools, or a modeling tool and a development tool (0082 – 0084, see supports Java and C++ and see ability to define an implementation language for M3).

Regarding claim 11 the method of claim 1, further comprising associating a requirement with a portion of a model in the blue print other than a system requirement model (0135).

Regarding claim 12, the method of claim 1, wherein in the information is arranged in an artifact, and wherein providing documentation further comprises, specifying a relationship that enables an association between an unstructured artifact and a structured artifact (0127, discloses documenting the artifacts of software).

Regarding claim 13, the method of claim 12, wherein providing documentation further comprises using a standard to quantify and structure a non-structured artifact so an element within the non-structured artifact can be linked to an element of a structured artifact (0127, see documenting the artifacts).

Regarding claim 26, Little anticipates a computer-readable medium encoded with information comprising:

a plurality of blueprints, each of said plurality of blueprints comprising artifacts that relate to a software-based solution to a problem in a given business and, the artifacts comprising:

- a vision and operations model for said given business (0129);

- a process model for said given business (0130);

a functional model for said given business (0151 – 0156);  
an infrastructure model for said given business (0151 – 0156); and  
relationship information linking a first artifact to a second artifact (0127, see documenting artifacts).

Little doesn't explicitly disclose wherein it provides a cross-referenced representation of business processes that occur within the enterprise. However, Lau in an analogous art and similar configuration discloses in (13:65 - 14:20) that,

"...artifacts are generated by the parsing and importing subsystem by parsing the interface definition stored in the source files...Once the interface definitions have been parsed, the parsing and importing subsystem then stores (i.e, imports) the parsed interfaced definitions...Once the parsed interface definition has been imported into the data model, the same template based code generation scheme is used by the code generator to emit the necessary code to make the generated object correspond to the Business Object environment...". Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine, little and Lau, because it would enable referencing parsed definitions for corresponding Business object environments as suggested by Lau above.

5. Claims 5 – 9, and 14 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al. US 2002/0091990 A1 in view of Hopwood et al. USPN 6,223,343 B1 and further in view of Lau 5,987,247.

Regarding claim 5, Little discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 1 above. Although Little doesn't expressly disclose wherein providing documentation further comprises providing a software component that performs tracing between a first element at a first abstraction level within the blueprint to a second element at a second abstraction level within the blueprint, Little does disclose that the designer is capable of reverse engineering the database files (0098). However, Hopwood in an analogous art and similar configuration of providing software based solutions including management and tracking and maintaining system discloses a revision management system which tracks and arranges the data in a relational format to implement grouping and packaging more efficiently (14:25 – 30). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Little and Hopwood because, it would make grouping and packaging of the elements more efficient.

Regarding claims 6 and 17, the method of claim 5, further comprising embodying the relationship in the form of electronic data (Little, 0130, see dynamic model and dynamic relationship).

Regarding claims 7 and 18, the method of claim 5, further comprising inferring the relationship from a second relationship that is embodied in pre-existing data (Little,



0130, see dynamic model and dynamic relationship, Examiner interprets the dynamic model and relationship to include relationships between all elements in the model).

Regarding claims 8 and 19 method of claim 1, Hopwood further discloses wherein providing documentation further comprises specifying a relationship that establishes said traceability between a plurality of modeling languages [Little, 0034, shows being able to plugin to in Java and C++, also discloses reverse engineering capabilities in 0098 and also see Hopwood which previously discloses tracking in 14:25 – 30].

Regarding claims 9 and 20, the method of claim 8, wherein said traceability is established by way of meta-meta model (Hopwood, 14:25 – 30 also see 18:45 – 65).

Regarding claim 14 the method of claim 1, wherein relationship is between a plurality of unstructured data, thereby enabling traceability between the plurality of unstructured data (Hopwood, 14:25 – 30, see tracking).

Regarding claim 15, Little discloses a method of facilitating the design of software-based solution comprising:  
receiving a selection of a blueprints from a plurality of blueprints, each of said blueprints comprising first information that relates to a industry, said blueprint being selected